

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyahara et al. (US 6,075,507) in view of Asada et al. (US 5,867,141).

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indications that claim 6 contains allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, and 10 to further define the invention.

Accordingly, claims 1-13 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to independent claims 1, 5, and 10, Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1, 5, and 10 to recite “wherein n is an integer greater than or equal to 2.” Furthermore, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite “(m-2)th” and (mth)” gate lines in accordance with the Examiner’s comments.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyahara et al. (US 6,075,507) in view of Asada et al. (US 5,867,141). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action admits that “Miyahara does not expressly teach conducting the data supply channel and conducting the data-supplying channel are performed simultaneously.” Thus, the Office Action relies upon Asada et al. for allegedly teaching “a driving method for liquid crystal display wherein the data supply channel and data-supplying channel are performed simultaneously (col. 13, lines 31-38).” As a result, the Office Action concludes that “[i]t would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Asada for simultaneously applying data to be incorporated to Miyahara’s device so as motivated by Asada, to be able to permit a competent image quality to be secured with a stable high contrast (col. 3, lines 62-65).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that Asada et al. fail to provide proper motivation with which to modify Miyahara et al. since Asada et al. fails to teach or suggest the desirability of simultaneously “conducting the first data supplying channel and conducting the second data supplying channel.”

MPEP § 2143.01 instructs that “[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggest the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).” Accordingly, because the applied art does not suggest the desirability of the

combination, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Regarding independent claims 5 and 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that Asada et al. fails to teach or suggest “a pre-charging controller continuously generating first and second gate start pulses such that data corresponding to an (n-2)th data line is supplied to an nth data line, wherein n is an integer greater than or equal to 2” and “applying the first and second gate start pulses to the gate driving integrated circuit.” In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action’s allegation that the claimed pre-charging controller is “fairly similar to the blanking period shown in figure 5 of Asada’s device” and that “the claims are substantially similar to claims 5 and 7-9 respectively, and would be analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5 and 7-9 above” is not correct. For example, the blanking period shown in FIG. 5 of Asada et al. fails to disclose “continuously generating first and second gate start pulses such that data corresponding to an (n-2)th data line is supplied to an nth data line, wherein n is an integer greater than or equal to 2,” as recited by independent claims 5 and 10, and “applying the first and second gate start pulses to the gate driving integrated circuit,” as recited by independent claim 5.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art reference, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: June 1, 2004

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000